DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 482 199 SP 041 791

AUTHOR	Hsiung, Yu-Lu; Arvold, Bridget; Johnson, Nancy; Wojtowicz, Patricia
TITLE	Students' and Cooperating Teachers' Perceptions of the Secondary Teacher Education Program.
SPONS AGENCY	Department of Education, Washington, DC.
PUB DATE	2003-04-00
NOTE	14p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Chicago, IL, April 21-25, 2003).
CONTRACT	P336990042-00A
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research (143) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Computer Uses in Education; *Cooperating Teachers; Educational Technology; Higher Education; Pedagogical Content Knowledge; Preservice Teacher Education; *Program Effectiveness; Program Evaluation; Secondary Education; Secondary School Teachers; Student Diversity; Student Needs; *Student Teacher Attitudes; *Student Teachers; Teacher Knowledge
IDENTIFIERS	Subject Content Knowledge; University of Illinois Urbana Champaign

ABSTRACT

This study, an evaluation component of the Mathematics English Technology Education Resources (METER) project, examined student teachers' and cooperating teachers' perceptions of the Secondary Teacher Education Program redesign at the University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign. METER was part of the Illinois Professional Learners' Partnership (IPLP) a federally funded 5-year program to improve the quality of teacher education programs. This study examined four of nine key focus areas of IPLP: teaching diverse student populations, content area knowledge, clinical experience, and technology integration. It focused on students' satisfaction with program components, cooperating teachers' perceptions of the program, and how the program responded to students' needs. Data were collected via program feedback forms, and results were organized by content area, student cohort, semester of enrollment, and common themes. Data analysis indicated that students' and cooperating teachers' perceptions of the program were inconsistent across content areas. There was evidence that the program responded to student needs. Students perceived program improvement in some areas but program decline in other areas. An appendix presents data on the percentage of students whose comments were significant themes. (SM)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 482 199

Students' and Cooperating Teachers' Perceptions of the Secondary Teacher Education Program

Yu-Lu Hsiung, Bridget Arvold, Nancy Johnson, Patricia Wojtowicz
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality

Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Yu-Lu Hsiung

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

SP041791

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Students' and Cooperating Teachers' Perceptions of the Secondary Teacher Education Program*

(Listed in AERA 2003 as: Student Perception of the Program as Springboard)

Yu-Lu Hsiung, Bridget Arvold, Nancy Johnson, Patricia Wojtowicz
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

Description and Significance of the Study

The Students' and Cooperating Teachers' Perceptions of the Secondary Teacher Education Program research study, one of the evaluation components of the Mathematics English Technology Education Resources (METER) project, investigated the students' and cooperating teachers' perceptions of the Secondary Teacher Education Program redesign at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. METER was a part of the Illinois Professional Learners' Partnership (IPLP), a federally funded 5-year program designed to improve the quality of teacher education programs. This study was related to four of the nine key focus areas of IPLP: teaching a diverse student population, content area knowledge, clinical experience, and integration of technology.

The development of this program evaluation was based on three research questions: (a) What are the students' satisfaction levels with the program components? (b) How is the program perceived by cooperating teachers? And (c) how did the program respond to the students' needs?

Description of the Secondary Teacher Education Program

The Secondary Teacher Education Program consists of course work as shown in Table 1.

Semester One (301)	C&I 301 Introduction to Teaching in a Diverse Society EOL 305 Legal and Professional Issues for Teachers C&I 235 Content Area Applications of Educational Technology (for English and Science students) 40 contact hours of field experiences
Semester Two (302)	C&I 302 Teaching Diverse Middle Grade Students SPED 205 Introduction to Serving Students with Special Needs EDPSY 320 Early Adolescent Development C&I 235 Content Area Applications of Educational Technology (for Mathematics and Social Studies students) 30 contact hours of field experiences
Semester Three (303)	C&I 303 Teaching Diverse Senior High School Students EDPSY 391 Assessment Issues for Classroom Teachers SPED 305 Teaching Students with Special Needs in the Classroom 30 contact hours field experiences
Semester Four (304)	C&I 304 Teaching and Assessing Secondary School Students EDPR 242 Student Teaching

Table 1. Sequence of course work.

* This material is based upon work supported by the Department of Education under Grant No.P336990042-00A. The government has certain rights in this material. Any opinions, findings, and conclusions or recommendations expressed in this material are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the views of the Department of Education.

The students who enter the program in the same year are in one cohort and go through the same sequence of courses and requirements together. Since a new cohort enters the program every year, one cohort's 301 and the other cohort's 303 semesters occur simultaneously, as do the respective 302 and 304 semesters.

During the first three semesters, students observe in different educational settings to gain field experiences. The 304 semester is when student teaching takes place. Each student is assigned two placements, one in a middle school and one in a high school, each for approximately seven weeks.

Instrumentation

Three instruments were used to collect feedback on the program: 1) Secondary Teacher Education Program Feedback Form, 2) Secondary Teacher Education Program Student Teacher Evaluation Form, and 3) Secondary Teacher Education Program Cooperating Teacher Evaluation Form. The Feedback Form was distributed at the end of the 301, 302, and 303 semesters in all content areas beginning with the Fall semester of 1998. The only exception was the 302 semester (Spring 1999) in English when the forms were not distributed.

The Secondary Teacher Education Program Feedback Form consisted of questions about each of the courses and field experiences for a particular semester. Students were also asked to describe the most helpful aspects of the program and to make recommendations for the program. The Secondary Teacher Education Program Student Teacher Evaluation Form consisted of questions about the high school placement, the middle school placement, the communication with cooperating teachers, the methods course, and the overall teacher education program. The Secondary Teacher Education Program Cooperating Teacher Evaluation Form consisted of questions about the student teacher's strengths, improvement areas, communication with methods course instructor, communication with supervisor, and recommendation for the teacher education program.

The forms were developed prior to the METER project. When the METER project began, the surveys served as data collection tools for the program evaluation. The Feedback Form had undergone several changes during the project. First, when the faculty and staff originally designed the forms, the intention was to use them as a feedback tool for the course instructors. Thus, in the semesters when the students took the special education course and educational psychology course, the forms included those two courses in the questions. These questions were not present in the forms distributed in the 301 semester. Second, the question related to the technology course was deleted from the survey after two semesters because the instructor of the course withdrew from the research study. Third, the format of the forms changed after Spring 2000. Prior to the change, the questions about each course were in an open-ended format with a general recommendation section at the end. The new forms had the similar questions but required the students to write one thing they liked and one thing they wanted to see improved about the courses. Again, a general recommendation section was placed under each question. Although the answers collected from the new forms were shorter and not as rich as the answers obtained from the old forms, the change was necessary to ensure that the students would comment on the positive and negative aspects of the program. The inconsistency in the forms had the disadvantages of making the interpretation of the data more difficult; however, the different questions and formats produced valuable data that would not have been collected if the forms had been more consistent.

Subjects and Data Collection

The participants in this study comprised two cohorts of students enrolled in the Secondary Teacher Education Program. The first cohort, labeled as Cohort A, began in Fall 1998 and ended in Spring 2000; Cohort B began in Fall 1999 and ended in Spring 2001. The number of evaluation forms collected varied from semester to semester because not all students returned the form. Table 2 presents the number of surveys collected for each semester in each content area.

	Cohort A					Cohort B				
	Fall 98 (301)	Spring 99 (302)	Fall 99 (303)	Spring 00 (304)	Spring 00 (Coop)	Fall 99 (301)	Spring 00 (302)	Fall 00 (303)	Spring 01 (304)	Spring 01 (Coop)
Math	31	25	29	22	29	16	16	10	15	10
English	45	none	46	44	47	40	39	40	39	25
Social Studies	27	26	24	19	27	24	30	20	25	20
Science	16	18	19	18	29	18	21	22	22	14

Table 2. Number of surveys collected in each semester.

Methods of Analysis

The comments of the students were organized according to the content area, the cohort, the semester of enrollment, and common themes. The survey results are compiled into one documents for each semester and each cohort. Initially the codes were derived from the IPLP key focus areas such as diversity and technology, but these categories soon became insufficient because students' commented on the more detailed aspects of the program such as time scheduling problems. Thus a code was assigned for each comment that would capture the main idea of it. Then, similar codes were combined. For example, inconvenient class time blocks and long class period were combined into the category schedule. Each code was attached with a plus sign (+) or a minus sign (-) to mark whether the comments were positive or negative. Table 3 includes some examples of codes. After each comment is coded, percentages were calculated to show how many participants contributed to each theme. The patterns were compared to the program policy and curriculum changes to establish relationships, if any.

Code	Theme	Example
#meet-	number of class meetings	The class only met once.
div-	diversity	The placement school did not have diverse student population.
e+	overall experience	The field experience was very good.
goal+	goals of the course	The goals were accomplished.
inst+	Instructor	Prof. X is excellent.
org-	organized	The program is unorganized.
web+	Web project	Making the web page was helpful.
work-	workload	Too much reading.

Table 3. Examples of codes used in the analysis.

The data were analyzed in two stages. First, data from both cohorts under each content area were coded. Second, a chart similar to the ones in Appendix A was used to organize the information drawn from each content area's data. A similar chart was also used to organize the student teaching evaluation data and the cooperating teacher evaluation data. Third, the data from the four content areas were compared to find themes and patterns. Any theme that was made by at least 20% of the participants was considered an important theme.

Findings

The students' responses were categorized by three areas: teaching a diverse student population, clinical experiences, and technology. To evaluate students' content area knowledge, we used the data collected from the cooperating teachers. In this section of the report we first list the major themes from each content area before presenting an aggregated list of themes that were found in at least half of the four content areas. The themes are presented in Appendix A. The themes related to technology were not trends or patterns because the question on technology courses were not in the surveys for Cohort B. Therefore, we present the technology-related themes after the aggregated themes.

Mathematics

Teaching a diverse student population. Two themes were prominent for the Mathematics students. Initially, the goals for the methods course (Introduction to Teaching in a Diverse Society) were unclear to many students (26%). This number decreased in the next three semesters to a zero percent. In addition, Cohort B made more positive comments, compared to Cohort A, on how the methods courses helped them become reflective teachers. "The methods courses really taught me how to think about teaching. I learned how to take into account every little factor when creating a lesson."

Clinical experiences. The number of positive comments about field experience declined prior to student teaching. In the first semester, 29% of Cohort A gave positive comments about the field experiences, 24% students in the next semester, and only 10% in the third semester. In the student teaching semester, 36% of the students made positive comments about their field experiences. The same trend was true for Cohort B; the percentages of positive comments decreased from 31% to 31% to 0% but increased to 80% (middle school) and 40% (high school) during student teaching.

Another themes was that the students in Cohort B perceived their clinical experience as substandard because they were placed in classrooms that did not match their content area. This problem was not reported by Cohort A. "Well, considering we (myself and a fellow student) were not placed with a math instructor, our 'understandings of school teaching and learning of our content area' could not readily be enhanced." "While I was there, I observed one-half hour of math classes. The rest was reading, study hall, etc. My teacher was very nice and [name] helped me with it, but it is a joke that I can't see a math class. Whoever did the placements did an awful job."

In addition to placement match, the characteristics of their mentors or cooperating teachers were also perceived as part of the field experiences' quality. "I had a great experience. My cooperating teacher and supervisor were both very helpful." "My cooperating teacher was wonderful to work with—full of ideas and insight (after 4 years!), flexible, and wanting to be of assistance, available." "Mentor teacher didn't care. Wasn't helpful at all."

Having a sense of being accepted by the school community was important for the student teachers in both middle and high school placements for both cohorts, but there were more comments on this from Cohort B (60% and 40% versus 18% and 18%). Overall, Cohort B reported a better student teaching experience than Cohort A did.

Content area preparation. The cooperating teachers listed content area knowledge as an area of strength of the student teachers in both cohorts (72% and 70%). They also listed lesson planning as an area of strength (31% and 30%).

English

Teaching a diverse student population. Only Cohort A in the 301 semester responded positively (24% of the students) on the methods course's effort to prepare them to teach a diverse population. "I have began to develop new ideas on diversity that I didn't consider before." My eyes have been opened to our world as a group of diverse individuals, and the classroom needs to treat it as this. This is a goal that was successfully achieved in C&I 301." For the other semesters and for Cohort B, the percentage of students commenting positively was lower (the highest being 10%).

Cohort B perceived the course on teaching diverse students as practical in the 302 and 303 semesters while Cohort A did not. Twenty-eight percent of Cohort B commented positively about the practicality of the course compared to Cohort A's 7%.

Clinical experiences. The number of positive comments about field experience declined prior to student teaching. In the first semester, 42% of students gave positive comments about the field experiences, but only 24% in the third semester. In the student teaching semester, 55% of the students made positive comments about their middle school student teaching and 47% about their high school student teaching. The same trend was true for Cohort B; the percentages of positive comments decreased from 20% to 10% to 3%, but increased to 72% (middle school) and 56% (high school) during student teaching.

In the 301 semester, Cohort B described their clinical experiences as helpful in a practical way while Cohort A made more comments on how they learned from their field experiences. "This is the only valuable part of the class as it allowed me to gain practical knowledge but teaching." –A student in Cohort B. "Wow...I learned so much. I don't want to get into it, but it has been a great learning experience." –A student in Cohort A.

One negative theme from Cohort B in the 303 semester was that the scheduling of the field placements was inconvenient for 23% of the students. "Working around our class schedule. We are always late to observations or late to education classes."

Having a good cooperating teacher and a sense of being accepted by the school community was important for the student teachers. For example, 68% of Cohort B's high school student teachers commented on their cooperating teachers. Cohort B mentioned the quality of their cooperating teachers more than Cohort A did (68% vs. 23%). "[Name] was an excellent cooperating teacher. I really enjoyed her aid in forming structure in the classroom. She provides great feedback and supports open communication." –A student teacher in Cohort B.

Content area preparation. Fifty-five percent of Cohort A's cooperating teachers listed content area knowledge as strength of the student teachers as did 52% of Cohort B's. Content area knowledge weaknesses listed were grammar and writing, more so in Cohort A than Cohort B (27% vs. 16%).

Social Studies

Teaching a diverse student population. In the Secondary Teacher Education Program Student Teacher Evaluation Form, 26% of Cohort A and 32% of Cohort B student teachers commented on the positive learning experiences in their method courses.

Clinical experiences. The number of positive comments about field experience declined prior to student teaching. In the first semester, 44% of students gave positive comments about the field experiences, 19% in the 302 semester, and 17% in the third semester. In the student teaching semester, 47% of the students made positive comments about their middle school student teaching and 37% about their high school student teaching. The same trend was true for Cohort B; the percentages of positive comments decreased from 29% to 13% to 0%, but increased to 52% (middle school) and 40% (high school) during student teaching.

Both cohorts—Cohort B more so than Cohort A—expressed dissatisfaction about the mismatch of field experience placement to their content area. The problem was present in the 301 and the 302 semesters and not in the 303 or 304 semesters. Cohort B also complained more than Cohort A about time and scheduling problems, especially in the 302 semester (30%).

Having a good cooperating teacher and a sense of being accepted by the school community was important for the student teachers. For example, 20% of Cohort B high school student teachers commented positively on their cooperating teachers, while another 20% commented negatively on their cooperating teachers. "Another great placement. I had a good cooperating teacher. The staff there was great. They were supportive, personable, and very helpful." "The school was wonderful, but my cooperating teacher made the experience a negative one."

Content area preparation. Forty-one percent of Cohort A's cooperating teachers listed content area knowledge as strength of the student teachers as did 35% of Cohort B's.

Science

Teaching a diverse student population. There was a decreasing trend of negative comments about the course on teaching diverse students. The percentage decreased to a 0% in the 304 semester for both cohorts. The same was true for negative perceptions of unclear course goals. By the end of the 304 semester, both cohorts had 0% students commenting negatively about the course goals being unclear.

Clinical experiences. The number of positive comments about field experience declined prior to student teaching. In the first semester, 38% of students gave positive comments about the field experiences, 33% in the 302 semester, and 31% in the third semester. In the student teaching semester, 39% of the students made positive comments about their middle school student teaching and 83% about their high school student teaching. The trend was more prominent for Cohort B; the percentages of positive comments decreased from 50% to 19% to 0%, but increased to 55% (middle school) and 14% (high school) during student teaching.

A second theme related to clinical experience was that Cohort B had more complaints about placement mismatches to their content area than Cohort A. In the 302 semester, 48% of Cohort B commented on the problem of placement mismatch.

More students in Cohort A than Cohort B perceived that they learned from their field experiences, although in both cohorts the number of positive comments had a decreasing trend. Cohort A's percentage of students who made positive comments decreased from 56% (301) to 22% (302), 11% (303), and 0% (304). Cohort B's percentage decreased from 11% (301) to 10% (302), 9% (303), and 0% (304). However, 14% of Cohort B's middle school student teachers commented positively on the learning experience in their placement.

During student teaching, 83% of Cohort A compared to only 14% of Cohort B, was satisfied with their high school placement. But 55% Cohort B was satisfied, compared to a 39% of Cohort A, with the middle school placement. Having a good cooperating teacher was

important for the student teachers of both cohorts. However, more student teachers in Cohort B reported having a sense of being accepted by the school community was important compared to the student teachers in Cohort A. "[School] was positive and exciting. Teachers were helpful, administration and building was accommodating."

Content area preparation. Sixty-six percent of Cohort A's cooperating teachers listed content area knowledge as strength of the student teachers as did 93% of Cohort B's.

Across Content areas

Teaching a diverse student population. Students' perceptions on the program's effort to teach them about diversity were inconsistent. The perceptions varied across content areas. For example, for Mathematics, the student teachers of Cohort B commented positively about the diversity methods course. For English, the positive perceptions was consistent for both cohorts. For Social Studies, only the student teachers did not comment directly about diversity, rather they commented on the overall quality of the methods courses. For Science, the students commented negatively about the diversity methods course.

Content area preparation. Cooperating teachers consistently listed content area preparation as the student teachers' strength. The percentage of teachers varied from content area to content area, with Science being the group with the highest percentage of cooperating teachers listing this area of strength. The only place where content area knowledge was listed as a weakness was among the English student teachers, in the topics of grammar and writing.

Clinical experiences. Generally, the students perceived the field experiences as a valuable learning conduit. The pattern of fluctuating enthusiasm for field experiences was common in all four content areas. Placements mismatched to the students' content area were a problem common to all content areas except English. Such mismatched placements affected negatively the students' perception of their placement. In all content areas, quality of mentors and cooperating teachers was a strong factor in student perception of the placements. Mathematics and Social Studies were the two content areas where the quality of mentors or cooperating teachers was perceived as negative. Having a sense of being accepted by the school community in field placements was also important for all four content area students.

Technology

Although technology related perceptions were collected only in two semesters, the data were included in this report to illustrate one major theme that the students perceived: the inconsistency within the Secondary Teacher Education Program. The following themes show that there is little similarity among the students' perceptions from the four content areas. The students' perceptions of the technology component of the program did not follow a pattern. Each content area and cohort had different appreciation and complaints about the course.

Mathematics. In 302, the students made a large number of complaints on the software program TEBase (32%). However, the same group of students listed technology as one of the most helpful aspect of the program, more so than the field experience (11 vs. 7 comments, which is 44% vs. 28% of students). Twenty-six percent of students thought the wide variety of technology used was valuable. "I enjoyed learning the various technological devices, but didn't get too much use out of TE Base."

English. The students made positive comments about the amount of learning (20% of students), the web page project (29%), and the Webboard discussion (16%). Twenty-five percent of the students said that the technology component was well integrated within the methods course. "Yes! I can't believe I have a web page! [Name] was very helpful and very available to us. Webboard was great for me too."

Social Studies. Cohort A found the technology component to be very frustrating for both 301 and 302 semesters, with a total of 39 negative and only 9 positive comments and 38 negative and 10 positive comments respectively. "This strand was horribly done. Too many assumptions were made about prior computer knowledge & most of the assignments were impossible to complete because something was messed up in the lab or the instructions. It turned out to be a huge hassle with little reward. Moreover, I don't have time to spend at the lab when I have an EOL paper, observations, and a C&I paper too. Take it easy on us!"

Science. Technology was perceived as poor in 301 (9 positive comments and 17 negative comments) to very poor in 302 (no positive comments and 17 negative comments). The type of complaints concentrated instructional delivery and organization in 301 and organization and learning of technology in 302. "I don't understand what needs to be done. I would like instruction instead of self learning when it comes to computers and technology." "We did integrate technology, but nothing new really, because there was no technology person present or really teach us anything and follow through with it."

In summary, all content areas' perceptions of the technology strand were different.

The students' comments contained other themes that were not classified under the key focus areas. First, the students' perceptions of the program were associated with their perception of the quality of their instructors. For example, when the Science students evaluated the course Teaching Students with Special Needs in the Classroom, 42% of Cohort A and 73% of Cohort B commented largely on the excellent quality of the instructor and little about the course itself. "Mr. [Name] is the best teacher in the education program! He knows what he is talking about, has experience as a teacher, and is caring. A great teacher."

Second, stranding courses was perceived as unorganized and was not well received. A stranded course had its total number of hours distributed in several semesters. The students registered for a course and completed a small portion of it in the subsequent semesters. The course instructors met with the students for only a few hours each semester. Many students perceived this system confusing due to not being able to keep track of the courses. For example, 21% of Cohort A of Mathematics students in 303 stated the meeting times were too short or were not aware that they had meetings. "We only met once this semester" "Did we even meet?" Organization problems accompanied the strand system was obvious in the beginning of the program redesign. Twenty-nine percent of Math Cohort A requested more organization. "More organization! There are lots of good intentions going on here, but some stuff didn't seem to work or be that clear. I understand that this is a new thing, but the bugs need to be worked out more quickly."

Third, the students perceived an inconsistent workload across the different content areas. Cohort B English students in 303 complained about workload more than any other groups of students. Eighty-eight percent of the students perceived they were given too much work "The workload is tremendous. It made it hard to focus in on what was actually being taught."

Discussion

We present the common themes across all the content areas in this section, as it is the whole program and not the individual disciplinary areas that we are interested in evaluating.

Inconsistency in Diversity Preparation

An underlying issue in students' perceptions of the program is the practice of academic freedom, an important aspect of the university's culture. While the program is designed with the intention of providing consistent quality preparation for teachers, it also must allow the faculty the freedom to teach as it sees fit, within some general guidelines. In many students' responses the instructor was the one who was being evaluated rather than the program. Perhaps because of differing philosophies or perceptions of the relevance of diversity in a particular content area, not every instructor placed equal weight or used a similar approach on the topic of diversity. This difference resulted in a variance among students' perceptions of the program's effectiveness in preparing them to teach a diverse population. With such variety of teaching practices, it was difficult to find a pattern in the effectiveness of the program. The balance between program consistency and academic freedom is a dilemma that the program has yet to resolve.

Consistent Content Area Knowledge

The Secondary Teacher Education Program is selective in the admission process. Only the students with top grades in their content area major are considered for admission to the program. This policy ensures that the graduates are not only prepared in their teaching skills, but also in their knowledge of the subject matters.

Fluctuation of Field Experience Enthusiasm

Some of the themes could not be explained by the program's structure alone. For example, in every cohort, students' perception of the value of the field experiences became less positive every semester prior to the student teaching. This was possibly due to their becoming accustomed to observing in classrooms and not because the placements were consistently worse every semester. When they student taught, the new sense of ownership and the opportunity to actually teach increased their enthusiasm about their clinical experiences.

Placement Mismatch

We speculate that some factors outside the scope of this study might have also influenced students' perception of the program. For example, although the program had difficulty in placing both cohorts in the requested content area classrooms due to the limited number of schools available in the area, Cohort B complained more about placement mismatch than Cohort A. The data collected for this study did not contain information for explaining this difference. Each group of students has its own characteristics and unique group dynamics. An appreciation of this phenomenon would be critical to an accurate evaluation of the program.

Quality of Mentors or Cooperating Teachers

Students' perceptions of their field experiences were associated with their perception of the quality of the mentors and the cooperating teachers. However, this association was not clear from the students' input. For example, a student who had an unsatisfactory mentor believed that she learned very much by observing how not to teach, while another student perceived her unsatisfactory mentor is the cause of her not learning from the field experience. Nevertheless, when the surveys asked for comments on the field experience, a large number of students chose to include information on their mentors or cooperating teachers, implying that these teachers were important aspects of their field experiences.

Sense of Being Accepted by the School Community

The students' perceptions of field experience were also associated with how they felt as a member in the school where field experience took place. Many students concluded that the

experience was positive because the school was welcoming, the staff was helpful, or the team was collaborative. On the contrary, students who mentioned cold attitudes from the staff, political conflicts in the school, or controlling staff or administrators perceived their field experiences as less positive.

Program Response to Student Feedback

The Secondary Teacher Education Program has been striving to prepare the students as future teachers. The students' perceptions were constantly being evaluated, and changes were implemented accordingly. For example, one of the students' perceptions was that stranded courses were confusing. After evaluating the situation, the program decided that stranding was not a practical system. The program had converted all courses to be stand-alone. Another example of program response is in the technology course. The software TEBase which was perceived as unhelpful, is no longer in use, while the components that the students perceived as useful and meaningful such as the web page projects and the Webboard discussions were retained. A third example is the program's response to students' request for more organization. As mentioned above, many students requested that the program be more organized. By the end of 302 semester of Cohort B, only one person made this request.

The evolution of the program affects how the students perceived the program, but not in a uniform fashion. The students' perception of the program changed from semester to semester, across content areas, and between the cohorts. We speculate that students' perception varied largely due to change in the social-cultural context of the program such as the structure of the program, the relationship among the students and the instructors, the resources available for accommodating student needs, the instructors, etc. For example, cohort A and cohort B had different instructors for their methods courses. This difference may account for the difference in the actual learning experiences that the cohorts had, and/or it may account for the difference in their perceptions of these experiences. Students' perceptions also varied because they evaluate the program through some lenses, such as their cultural background, expectation of the program, attitude towards the subject matters and teaching, and other factors.

Conclusion

The study showed that the students and cooperating teachers' perceptions of the Secondary Teacher Education Program were inconsistent across content areas. There were evidences that the program responded to student needs. Students perceived program improvement in some areas. In other areas, the reverse was perceived. However, due to many factors out of the scope of this study, we cannot conclude how these perception patterns were formed. Relevant questions surfaced from this study include (a) What is the nature of instructor and program consistencies? (b) Why do cross-cohort and cross-content area differences exist? And (c) will the students' perception of the program change after they graduate and start their teaching career?

As this study only focused on students' and cooperating teachers' perceptions, many other aspects of the program were not addressed, for example, the program faculty's and college administration's perceptions. We need a more systematic evaluation of the whole program's responsiveness to students' needs. A longitudinal study that tracks the students who participated in the study will help us understand better the effectiveness of this program in preparing teachers for high-need schools.

Appendix A

Percentage of Students whose Comments were Significant Themes

Mathematics

Themes	Cohort A Fall 1998~Spring 2000				Cohort B Fall 1999~Spring 2001			
	301semester 31 respondents	302 semester 25 respondents	303 semester 29 respondents	304 semester 22 respondents	301 semester 16 respondents	302 semester 16 respondents	303 semester 10 respondents	304 semester 15 respondents
Diversity								
Goal unclear	26%	20%	7%	NA	25%	0%	0%	NA
Reflection	0%	4%	1%	1%	0%	0%	10%	40%
Overall good	0%	0%	0%	10%	0%	0%	0%	40%
Clinical experience								
Overall +	29%	24%	10%	36% (both cohorts)	31%	31%	0%	80% & 40%*
Overall -	0%	0%	3%	0% & 9%	19%	25%	0%	33% & 13%
Mismatch	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	25%	10%	0%
Mentor/Coop +	3%	8%	0%	41% & 59%	0%	0%	19%	26% & 31%
Mentor /Coop-	3%	0%	0%	0% and 4%	31%	13%	0%	13% and 6%
Acceptance by school community (MS)	NA	NA	NA	18% & 18%	NA	NA	NA	60% & 40%

*The first percentage represent number of comments about the middle school placement and the second percentage, the high school placement

English

Themes	Cohort A Fall 1998~Spring 2000				Cohort B Fall 1999~Spring 2001			
	301 semester 45 respondents	302 semester no respondents	303 semester 46 respondents	304 semester 44 respondents	301 semester 40 respondents	302 semester 39 respondents	303 semester 40 respondents	304 semester 25 respondents
Diversity								
Diversity +	24%	No data	0%	7%	0%	5%	10%	0%
Practical +	0	No data	7%	0%	0%	28%	23%	0%
Clinical experience								
Overall +	42%	No data	24%	55% & 47%	20%	10%	3%	72% & 56%
Learning	33%	No data	7%	5% & 9%	15%	15%	5%	4% & 16%
Practical	9%	No data	4%	0%	30%	0%	0%	0%
Schedule problem	0%	No data	0%	0%	0%	0%	23%	0%
Mentor/Coop +	2%	No data	2%	16% & 23%	8%	13%	15%	64% & 68%
Acceptance by school community (MS)	2%	No data	4%	20% & 16%	0%	0%	0%	20% & 28%

Appendix A Continued

Social Studies

Themes	Cohort A Fall 1998–Spring 2000				Cohort B Fall 1999–Spring 2001			
	301 semester 27 respondents	302 semester 26 respondents	303 semester 24 respondents	304 semester 19 respondents	301 semester 24 respondents	302 semester 30 respondents	303 semester 20 respondents	304 semester 25 respondents
Diversity								
Methods course +	NA	NA	NA	26%	NA	NA	NA	32%
Clinical experience								
Overall +	44%	19%	17%	47% & 37%	29%	13%	0%	52% & 40%
Mentor/Coop +	4%	0%	4%	31% & 16%	4%	7%	0%	8% & 20%
Mentor/Coop -	4%	4%	4%	0% & 16%	4%	0%	5%	8% & 20%
Mismatch	15%	4%	0%	0%	17%	23%	0%	0%
Acceptance by school community (MS)	4%	0%	0%	21% & 26%	0%	0%	10%	32% & 16%
Schedule problem	0%	12%	0%	0%	0%	30%	15%	0%

Science

Themes	Cohort A Fall 1998–Spring 2000				Cohort B Fall 1999–Spring 2001			
	301 semester 16 respondents	302 semester 18 respondents	303 semester 19 respondents	304 semester 18 respondents	301 semester 18 respondents	302 semester 21 respondents	303 semester 22 respondents	304 semester 22 respondents
Diversity								
Diversity -	44%	0%	5%	0%	17%	0%	18%	0%
Goal unclear	25%	56%	26%	0%	39%	19%	5%	0%
Clinical experience								
Overall +	38%	33%	31%	39% & 83%	50%	19%	0%	55% & 14%
Mismatch	6%	17%	11%	0%	22%	48%	27%	0%
Mentor/Coop +	19%	6%	5%	39% & 50%	11%	14%	23%	27% & 5%
Acceptance by school community (MS)	0%	0%	0%	11% & 16%	0%	0%	14%	27% & 0%
Learning	56%	22%	11%	0%	11%	10%	9%	14% & 0%

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

ERIC Educational Resources Information Center

REPRODUCTION RELEASE

(Specific Document)

I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title: Students' and Cooperating Teachers' Perceptions of the Secondary Teacher Education Program

Author(s): Yu-Lu Hsiung, Bridget Arvold, Nancy Johnson, Patricia Wojtowicz

Corporate Source: University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

Publication Date: April 22, 2003 (AERA Chicago)

II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, *Resources in Education* (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce and disseminate the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following three options and sign at the bottom of the page.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 1 documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

Level 1

☑

Check here for Level 1 release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche or other ERIC archival media (e.g., electronic) *and* paper copy.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2A documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE, AND IN ELECTRONIC MEDIA FOR ERIC COLLECTION SUBSCRIBERS ONLY, HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2A

Level 2A

☐

Check here for Level 2A release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche and in electronic media for ERIC archival collection subscribers only.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2B documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2B

Level 2B

☐

Check here for Level 2B release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche only.

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits.
If permission to reproduce is granted, but no box is checked, documents will be processed at Level 1.

I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce and disseminate this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche or electronic media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries.

Sign here, → please

Signature:	Printed Name/Position/Title: Yu-Lu Hsiung
Organization/Address: 311 Education Bldg, 1310 S. 6th St Champaign, IL 61820	Telephone: 217 367-9626 FAX:
	E-Mail Address: yhsiung@uiuc.edu Date: 5/19/03

(Over)

III. DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY INFORMATION (FROM NON-ERIC SOURCE):

If permission to reproduce is not granted to ERIC, *or*, if you wish ERIC to cite the availability of the document from another source, please provide the following information regarding the availability of the document. (ERIC will not announce a document unless it is publicly available, and a dependable source can be specified. Contributors should also be aware that ERIC selection criteria are significantly more stringent for documents that cannot be made available through EDRS.)

Publisher/Distributor:
Address:
Price:

IV. REFERRAL OF ERIC TO COPYRIGHT/REPRODUCTION RIGHTS HOLDER:

If the right to grant this reproduction release is held by someone other than the addressee, please provide the appropriate name and address:

Name:
Address:

V. WHERE TO SEND THIS FORM:

Send this form to the following ERIC Clearinghouse: **University of Maryland**
ERIC Clearinghouse on Assessment and Evaluation
1129 Shriver Lab, Bldg 075
College Park, MD 20742
Attn: Acquisitions

However, if solicited by the ERIC Facility, or if making an unsolicited contribution to ERIC, return this form (and the document being contributed) to:

University of Maryland
ERIC Clearinghouse on Assessment and Evaluation
1129 Shriver Lab, Bldg 075
College Park, MD 20742
Attn: Acquisitions